

**Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board**

1422 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 3, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825

TELEPHONE: (916) 263-2666/ FAX: (916) 263-2668

www.slpad.ca.gov

**SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY BOARD
MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA
August 18-19, 2005**

Department of Consumer Affairs
Medical Board of California
1424 Howe Avenue
Greg Gorges Conference Room "F"
Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 263-2666

**CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 19, 2005****Board Members Present**

Marcia Raggio, Ph.D., Chairperson
Rebecca Bingea, M.A.
Alison Grimes, Au.D.
Jennifer Hancock, M.A.
Carol Murphy, M.A.
Paul Donald, M.D.
Diana Verdugo M.S.

Staff Present

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer
Candace Raney, Staff Analyst
Lori Pinson, Staff Analyst
George Ritter, Legal Counsel

Guests Present

Robert Powell, California Speech-Language-Hearing Association
Jane Moir, Los Angeles Office of Education
Rookie Hirsh, Speech-Language Pathologist

2:30 p.m. – Continuing Professional Development Committee

(Chair, Murphy, Bingea, Hancock, Verdugo)

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Murphy called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

II. Introductions

Those present introduced themselves.

III. Continuing Professional Development Course Review
Consider Appeal Regarding the Denial for Continuing Professional Development Course Credit: “Clinical Aspects of Alzheimer’s Disease and Related Disorders,” Sponsored by HEALTH ED.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that the staff had previously denied the course after reviewing at least two letters sent by Health Ed describing the course offering and requesting the Board to approve the course for continuing professional development (CPD) credit. She stated that staff made several requests to Health Ed to forward the specific course outline or brochure so that staff could better understand the course format and the material that was actually presented to the attendees. Ms. Del Mugnaio reported that Health Ed instead forwarded multiple course evaluation forms completed by speech-language pathologists who rated the course informative and useful. She referenced Health Ed’s most recent letter of February 17, 2005, that included a course outline and a description of the intended learning objectives. She explained that the learning objectives described in the letter (... “Describe the relationships between dementia and aphasia, apraxia,...including language and communication similarities and differences,to determine the cognitive-communication disturbances specific to each dementia,) appear to be directly relevant to the practice of speech-language pathology. However, such information was not available at the time staff made the initial determination to deny the course offering.

Ms. Bingea inquired whether the letter, including the course outline and learning objectives reflected a modified or revised course from that which was initially reviewed and denied by staff.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that she is unsure whether the information in the letter actually represented a course offering, or if it was a justification letter developed specifically for the Committee to consider on appeal.

Ms. Hancock asked whether there is a process for continuing professional development providers to submit course modifications to the Board for consideration.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that currently there are no formal time frames or forms that must be completed in order to notify the Board of a change in a CPD course offering. She explained that a letter submitted by the provider, notifying the Board of such a change, including a course outline or brochure, would be sufficient.

Ms. Murphy stated that the Committee could not make a determination regarding the content of the course in terms of its relevance to the practice of speech-language pathology unless it was clear whether information contained in Health Ed’s letter of February 17, 2005 was, in fact, the actual course presentation.

M/S/C Bingea/Verdugo

The Committee voted to uphold the denial of the course “Clinical Aspects of Alzheimer’s Disease and Related Disorders,” Sponsored by HEALTH ED, and directed staff to send a letter to the provider explaining that the course was denied due to the fact that the

Committee could not verify if the information submitted for the purpose of the appeal was the same information presented at the time of the course offering.

IV. Review Proposed Continuing Professional Development Emergency Regulations- California Code of Regulation Sections 1399.151.1, 1399.160.3, 1399.160.4 1399.160.6, & 1399.160.7

The Committee reviewed the proposed changes and the outlined suggestions of the subject matter experts.

Ms. Bingea addressed one of the subject matter expert's comments regarding limiting the number of hours of CPD credit to 50% that an audiologist may earn through courses sponsored by hearing aid manufacturers, and stated that the language may need to be clarified to state "presented by" as opposed to "sponsored by." She stated that some course offerings presented by audiologists may be sponsored by hearing aid manufacturers, however, the content of the course is not devoted to marketing the product but instead covers diagnostic issues. She explained that since the intent of the language was to limit the number of hours in hearing aid product marketing, the change in wording would not compromise that goal.

Ms. Raggio stated that it was her understanding that the proposed language was intended to limit the number of hours that audiologists could earn in any hearing aid related course.

The Committee agreed to table the discussion regarding limiting audiologists to a specific number of hearing aid related courses until the October meeting when other audiology members would be available to comment.

Ms. Bollenbacher distributed two tables outlining courses that had been previously reviewed by staff and had been approved or denied.

Ms. Hancock stated that the tables are extremely helpful, however, she was uncertain about the acronyms used for the course providers. She also suggested that some of the course headings listed, e.g., brain injury, could definitely be relevant to speech-language pathology. She stated that without a course description or any comments about why the course was denied, it would be difficult to grasp what criteria is applied to evaluating a course for CPD credit.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that Ms. Bollenbacher can further develop the tables so that the information represented is clear.

Ms. Murphy stated that it may be helpful to identify core practice areas or subject matter that is repeatedly offered for continuing professional development and whether these broad areas meet the CPD regulation criteria of direct or indirect practice relevance.

Mr. Ritter suggested that the Board consider citing examples of acceptable and unacceptable course content areas in the CPD regulations.

The Committee discussed the need to clarify the regulation language regarding acceptable course content as it applied to direct and indirect practice relevance and determined that the issue should be further examined at the October Board meeting once the new

Committee members had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the regulation proposal.

Ms. Moir inquired whether the CPD providers will be notified of the proposed changes regarding the new course approval process and the imposed course submission time frames.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the CPD providers have been kept apprised of the proposed changes and will continue to be notified as changes unfold.

Ms. Hirsh asked whether the Committee conducted analyses or prepared justifications to support its denial of broad content areas as relevant to the practice of speech-language pathology. She stated that she was specifically interested in the area of behavior modification.

Ms. Del Mugnaio responded that the Committee has not denied any one content area. She invited Ms. Hirsh to submit data to the Committee supporting the need for continued education in a particular area if she was interested in the Committee's ruling on a specific topic.

V. Consider Development of Continuing Professional Development Subject Matter Expert Training and Guidelines

Ms. Del Mugnaio referenced sample subject matter expert's evaluations included in the meeting packets.

Ms. Bollenbacher stated that the evaluations submitted are not uniform and in some cases do not take into consideration the CPD course criteria as provided in the regulations. She suggested that developing a subject matter expert evaluation form may be helpful for both the subject matter experts, in terms of capturing the information that should be reviewed and reported, and for her to identify the basis for the expert's recommendation.

Ms. Hancock and Ms. Binge agreed to create a draft subject matter expert evaluation form for the Committee to consider at its October meeting.

There being no further discussion, Chairperson Murphy adjourned the meeting at 2:17 p.m.

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer